

City of Las Vegas

AGENDA MEMO

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING DATE: OCTOBER 11, 2007

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

ITEM DESCRIPTION: VAC-24276 - APPLICANT/OWNER: TR BOULDERS CORPORATION

**** CONDITIONS ****

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL, subject to:

1. The limits of this Petition of Vacation shall be the ingress/egress easements generally located within the Boulders Subdivision (Amended) for property located on the southeast corner of Hualapai Way and Gowan Road.
2. All development shall be in conformance with code requirements and design standards of all City Departments.
3. If the Order of Vacation is not recorded within one (1) year after approval by the City of Las Vegas or an Extension of Time is not granted by the Planning Director, then approval will terminate and a new petition must be submitted.

VAC-24276 - Staff Report Page One
October 11, 2007 - Planning Commission Meeting

**** STAFF REPORT ****

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This request is a petition to Vacate public ingress/egress easements located within the Boulders Subdivision (Amended) on the east side of Hualapai Way south of Gowan Road. The driveway easements are located on Hualapai Way and Gowan Road. The existing condominium development is being converted to an apartment complex. Public Works no longer requires the public ingress/egress easements. Staff recommends approval of the Vacation.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

<i>Related Relevant City Actions by P&D, Fire, Bldg., etc.</i>	
Month/date/year	Action
03/06/96	The property was annexed into the City of Las Vegas (A-0025-95). The Planning Commission and staff recommended approval.
06/23/97	The City Council approved the Rezoning (Z-0033-97) to PD (Planned Development) for the Lone Mountain Master Plan Area. The subject parcel was designated for Medium Density (maximum of 18 units per acre) Land Uses by that Plan. The Planning Commission and staff recommended approval.
01/14/99	The Planning Commission approved the request for a Site Development Plan Review [Z-0033-97(8)] for a proposed 384-unit apartment community complex.
01/05/05	The City Council approved a request for a Site Development Plan Review (SDR-5493) for a 388 unit multi-family condominium conversion development on 21.3 acres at 3450 North Hualapai Way.
01/13/05	The Planning Commission approved a Request for a Tentative Map (TMP-5593) for a 388-Unit Residential Condominium Subdivision on 21.3 acres at 3450 North Hualapai Way.
03/10/05	A request for a Final Map (FMP-6052) Technical Review was approved for a 388-unit residential Condominium Subdivision on 19.89 acres at 3450 North Hualapai Way. The map was recorded on 12/23/2005. An amended map (for addressing) was recorded on 07/17/2006

SDR-24274 - Staff Report Page Two
October 11, 2007 - Planning Commission Meeting

<i>Pre-Application Meeting</i>	
07/30/07	Discussed proposed submittal and Title 19.18.050 requiring an SDR for the conversion of condominiums to apartments.

<i>Neighborhood Meeting</i>	
A neighborhood meeting is not required, nor was one held.	
<i>Field Check</i>	
09/07/07	The site is fully developed with two-story multi-family residential buildings. One driveway is located on Hualapai Way and the second driveway is on Gowan Road.

<i>Details of Application Request</i>	
<i>Site Area</i>	
Gross Acres	21.30

Surrounding Property	Existing Land Use	Planned Land Use	Existing Zoning
Subject Property	Condominiums	PCD(Planned Community Development)	PD (Planned Development)
North	Undeveloped	PCD(Planned Community Development)-	C-V (Civic)
South	Undeveloped	PCD(Planned Community Development)	U(PCD) U(Undeveloped) Zone [PCD (Planned Community Development)General Plan Designation] U(PROD) U(Undeveloped) Zone [PROD(Parks/Recreation/OpenSpace
East	School/Park/Open Space	PROD(Parks/Recreation /Open Space)	PD (Planned Development)
West	Single Family Residential	PCD(Planned Community Development)	PD (Planned Development)

A request has been received from TR Boulders corporation to vacate public ingress/egress easements located within the Boulders Subdivision (Amended) on the east side of Hualapai Way south of Gowan Road.

SDR-24274 - Staff Report Page Three
October 11, 2007 - Planning Commission Meeting

The above property is legally described as follows:

A public ingress and egress easement in a portion of the east half (E $\frac{1}{2}$) of the northwest quarter (NW $\frac{1}{4}$) of the northwest quarter (NW $\frac{1}{4}$) of the southwest quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) of Section 7, Township 20 South, Range 60 East, M.D.M.

A public ingress and egress easement in a portion of the west half (W $\frac{1}{2}$) of the southwest quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) of the northwest quarter (NW $\frac{1}{4}$) of the southwest quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) of section 7, Township 20 South, Range 60 East, M.D.M.

ANALYSIS

A) Planning discussion

The applicant proposes to vacate existing public ingress/egress easements at the request of staff. Public dedications of the ingress/egress easements are no longer accepted by Public Works.

B) Public Works discussion

This Vacation application proposes to vacate existing public ingress/egress easements. As no right-of-way is proposed to be vacated, and thus no franchise rights are involved, it is not necessary to send this VAC request to the utility companies and franchise holders, nor wait for their responses. Since only City easements are involved; any utility company interests will not be affected.

We present the following information concerning this request to vacate certain public street ROW:

- A. Does this vacation request result in uniform or non-uniform right-of-way widths? N/A, this vacation request is for public ingress/egress easements only and not street right-of-way.
- B. From a traffic handling viewpoint will this vacation request result in a reduced traffic handling capability? No.
- C. Does it appear that the vacation request involves only excess right-of-way? Yes.
- D. Does this vacation request coincide with development plans of the adjacent parcels? Yes.

SDR-24274 - Staff Report Page Four
October 11, 2007 - Planning Commission Meeting

- E. Does this vacation request eliminate public street access to any abutting parcel? No.
- F. Does this vacation request result in a conflict with any existing City requirements? No.
- G. Does the Department of Public Works have an objection to this vacation request? No.

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS NOTIFIED 6

ASSEMBLY DISTRICT 4

SENATE DISTRICT 6

NOTICES MAILED 1

APPROVALS 0

PROTESTS 1